UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/244,304	02/03/1999	MICHAEL W. BEACH	EN998071	3605

7590 07/13/2004

SHELLEY M BECKSTRAND
314 MAIN STREET
OWEGO, NY 13827

EXAMINER	
SUBRAMANIAN, NARAYANSWAMY	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
3624	

DATE MAILED: 07/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/244,304	BEACH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Narayanswamy Subramanian	3624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 February 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *12-19* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *12-19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *03 February 1999* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. In view of the appeal filed on February 5, 2004, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. Finality of rejection made in the last office action (Paper No. 30) is withdrawn by the Examiner in view of newly discovered prior art. Claims 12-19 have been re-examined. A new ground of rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111; or,

(2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

Drawings

2. The drawings submitted by the Applicants are objected to by the Examiner. The informal drawings filed in this application are acceptable for examination purposes. When the application is allowed, applicant will be required to submit new formal drawings.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 12, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al (US Patent 6,05,380) in view of Rail et al (US Patent 5,680,611).

With reference to claims 12, 14 and 15, Anderson teaches a method, a computing system and a program storage device respectively for operating an account payable computing system, the method comprising: preprocessing before introduction into an accounts payable data base original electronic invoices received from a vendor to identify duplicate invoices (See Anderson Column 4 lines 26-30, 34-42) including: identifying invoices having a same vendor invoice designation (See Anderson Column 4 lines 34-35, existing account implies a vendor invoice designation), same purchase order number (See Anderson Column lines 26-28, purchase order number is inherent in 810/ 811 invoices), and same item number (See Anderson Column lines 26-28, item number is inherent in 810/ 811 invoices); automatically communicating a duplicate invoice rejection transaction to an intermediary for said original electronic invoice identified as a duplicate invoice without posting said original electronic invoice to said accounts payable data base (See Anderson Table 2); and introducing said original electronic invoices not identified as duplicate invoices into said accounts payable data base (See Anderson Column 4 lines 26-30). A computing system and a program storage device for performing the above method is inherent in the disclosure of Anderson.

Anderson does not teach the steps of calculating a net sum of items for a record, and identifying as a duplicate record an original record for which said net sum is greater than zero and communicating a transaction from an intermediary to the vendor.

Rail teaches the steps of calculating a net sum of items for a record, and identifying as a duplicate record an original record for which said net sum is greater than zero (See Rail abstract, Column 3 lines 55-57, Column 5 lines 38-49 and claims 1 and 2).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the steps taught by Rail to the disclosure of Anderson. The combination of the teaching taken as a whole suggests that the accounts payable department would have benefited from early detection of duplicate invoices.

Anderson and Rail combined do not explicitly teach the step of communicating a transaction from an intermediary to the vendor.

Official notice is taken that this step is old and well known in the art. This step facilitates better and faster communication between the parties concerned.

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include this step to the combined disclosures of Rail and Anderson. The combination of the teaching taken as a whole suggests that the accounts payable department would have benefited from early detection of duplicate invoices and communicating this information to the vendor.

5. Claims 13 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al (US Patent 6,05,380) in view of Rail et al (US Patent 5,680,611) and further in view of Smith et al (US Patent 5,111,395)

With reference to claim 13, Anderson and Rail combined teach a method of claim 12 as discussed above including the step of identifying invoice records having a same vendor invoice designation, same purchase order number, and same item number, calculating a net sum of

selected portions of a record and rejecting back as a duplicate record of said original record if the net sum is greater than zero.

Anderson and Rail combined do not explicitly teach the step of sequentially sorting the records by various fields within a record in order to identify duplicate records.

Smith teaches the step of sequentially sorting the records by various fields within a record in order to identify duplicate records (See Smith Column 1 lines 39-45, 49-51, Column 13 lines 19-21 and claim 1).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the step taught by Smith to the combined disclosures of Rail and Anderson. The combination of the teaching taken as a whole suggests that the accounts payable department would have benefited from early detection of duplicate invoices and avoid storing duplicate records in its database.

With reference to claims 16, 18 and 19, Anderson teaches a method, a computing system and a program storage device respectively for operating an accounts payable computing system, the method comprising: receiving an original electronic invoice from a vendor (See Anderson Column 2 lines 13-17); rejecting original electronic invoices received from vendors not initialized as trading partners (See Anderson Column 4 lines 34-42, Table 1, missing account implies that a vendor has not been initialized) , and translating original electronic invoices received from vendors initialized as trading partners (See Anderson Column 3 lines 48-50); assuring that during said translating the count of translated invoices rejected and accepted equals the number of original electronic invoices translated, and feeding accepted invoices for preprocessing (See Anderson Column 3 lines 48-55 and Column 4 lines 26-29); preprocessing

invoices accepted for preprocessing as received from a trading partner vendor, said preprocessing selectively validating a transaction, calculating line item accounts, deducting sales tax, and identifying original electronic invoices which are duplicate invoices before introduction into an accounts payable data base (See Anderson Column 4 lines 26-29, checks are interpreted to include these features), said identifying duplicate invoices including: auditing only debit invoices one at a time for duplicate invoices and committing to said accounts payable data base only those debit invoices which are not duplicate invoices (See Anderson Column 2 lines 47-48, debit invoices are implied in the disclosure); identifying invoices having a same vendor invoice designation, same purchase order number, and same item number (See discussion of Claim 12 above); said identifying including execution of check verbs, each said check verb being satisfied to identify said invoice as a duplicate invoice; said check verbs including determining that this vendor is a vendor for which duplicate invoice checking is to be performed (See Anderson Column 4 lines 26-29, 34-38 and Table 1, the checks are interpreted to include these features), determining that there is a purchase order history of previous purchase orders for said invoice (See Anderson Column 12 lines 20-24, invoice analysis is interpreted to include analysis of purchase order history), and determining for each item on said invoice a sum of its purchase order history, with said sum being greater than zero for at least one said item (See Anderson Column 4 lines 26-29, 34-38, the checks are interpreted to include these features); automatically communicating a duplicate invoice rejection transaction to an intermediary for an original electronic invoice identified as a duplicate invoice without posting said original electronic invoice to said accounts payable data base; posting said invoice to a workflow database and assuring that the number and amount of invoices posted to said workflow database equal the

number and amount of translated invoices accepted for preprocessing (old and well known in the art);logging to an error queue invoices failing audit for subsequent manual processing (See Anderson Table 12); logging to an exceptions and warnings log table as exceptions invoices which are determined during preprocessing to be duplicate invoices and as warnings invoices which during preprocessing were recalculated or had sales tax deducted (See Table 12); introducing said original electronic invoices not identified as duplicate invoices into said accounts payable data base (See discussion of Claim 12 above). A computing system and a program storage device for performing the above method is inherent in the disclosure of Anderson.

Anderson does not teach the steps of sorting all inbound records in a sequence, calculating a net sum of items for a record, and identifying as a duplicate record an original record for which said net sum is greater than zero and communicating a transaction from an intermediary to the vendor.

Rail teaches the steps of calculating a net sum of items for a record, and identifying as a duplicate record an original record for which said net sum is greater than zero (See Rail abstract, Column 3 lines 55-57, Column 5 lines 38-49 and claims 1 and 2).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the steps taught by Rail to the disclosure of Anderson. The combination of the teaching taken as a whole suggests that the accounts payable department would have benefited from early detection of duplicate invoices.

Anderson and Rail combined do not explicitly teach the steps of sorting all inbound records in a sequence and communicating a transaction from an intermediary to the vendor.

Smith teaches the step of sequentially sorting the records by various fields (See Smith Column 1 lines 39-45, 49-51, Column 13 lines 19-21 and claim 1). This sorting would have helped the system sort the records into debits/credits sequence and process them differently.

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the step taught by Smith to the combined disclosures of Rail and Anderson. The combination of the teaching taken as a whole suggests that the accounts payable department would have benefited from sorting the debits from the credits and from early detection of duplicate invoices.

Anderson, Rail and Smith combined do not explicitly teach the step of communicating a transaction from an intermediary to the vendor.

Official notice is taken that this step is old and well known in the art. This step facilitates better and faster communication between the parties concerned.

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include this step to the combined disclosures of Smith, Rail and Anderson. The combination of the teaching taken as a whole suggests that the accounts payable department would have benefited from early detection of duplicate invoices and communicating this information to the vendor.

With reference to claim 17, see discussion of claim 13 above.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 12-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Narayanswamy Subramanian whose telephone number is (703) 305-4878. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Thursday from 8:30 AM to 7:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached at (703) 308-1065. The fax number for Formal or Official faxes and Draft or Informal faxes to the Patent Office is (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

N. Subramanian
June 21, 2004

Richard Weisberger
Primary Examiner

VINCENT MILLIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600